

**Mountain View Corridor Air Working Group
Meeting Minutes
May 18, 2015**

Attendees:

- Reed Soper – UDOT Mountain View Corridor Project Team
- Cameron Cova – Breathe Utah
- Kathy Van Dame – Wasatch Clean Air Coalition
- Lee Logston – Planner, West Valley City
- Bo Call - Air Monitoring Section Manager, Division of Air Quality
- Linda Hansen - PTA
- Paul Roberts – Sonoma Technology, Inc.
- Andy Neff – Langdon Group (facilitator)
- Madison Sehlke – Langdon Group (co-facilitator)

Minutes:

- **Approval of 4/13/15 AWG Meeting Minutes**
 - Meeting minutes were approved for posting to the [AWG webpage](#).
- **GSD Portable Classroom Update**
 - Jerry and Paul are working to draft the portables memo and recommendations.
 - Paul's understanding is about 15 portables will be relocated (eight at Hunter Jr. High, six or seven at the elementary school and two others).
 - Jerry is working on the asbestos data and documentation. Current asbestos data from GSD is incomplete.
 - Bo noted that per state code, asbestos must be removed from all portables before they are demolished or moved.
 - Linda followed up with Steve Hogan and Dan Dotson re: the asbestos report and they will provide the info to Paul.
 - The group discussed where to draw the line with portables mitigation.
 - Per DEQ requirements, the AWG will not recommend mitigation for any portables with lingering asbestos issues.
 - It's possible portable classroom units could be moved outside the MVC corridor depending on needs. Linda noted that GSD has student growth projections. She will follow up with GSD and then let the group know their plans for future expansion and longevity for portables.
 - Reed suggested waiting until Sonoma's portables data becomes available and then conducting a cost-benefit analysis taking into consideration ages of the portables and their life expectancies.
- **DRAFT Cooperative Agreement**
 - Kathy asked Paul for additional clarification on the rationale for costs estimated in the Agreement.
 - The initial estimate included \$29K (including \$10K each for Hunter Jr. High and Hunter High and \$9K for the three smaller schools) for Jerry to oversee and

- review implementation. This figure may be removed from the Agreement, depending on the approach taken by the AWG.
 - Reed noted that a contract mod. would be needed for Jerry to do the work.
 - The AWG has discussed the possibility of hiring a local, independent, third-party consulting firm. The AWG will discuss the approach internally.
- Heath Engineering and Van Boerum & Frank are GSD's consultants who have developed contractor scopes in the past and are noted in the Agreement to maintain this consistency.
 - Linda noted that only the two consultants are mentioned in the Agreement. Will GSD be permitted to select the contractor(s)? Will GSD have any flexibility if doing the work in-house will save money?
 - Bo noted that the GSD's current contractor(s) of record will likely do the work. Reed suggested adding a line in the Agreement mentioning the contractor(s) of record.
 - Kathy noted that the ASHRAE specs are useful as they reference both filter capacity and efficiency.
- The group discussed if AWG maintenance funds should be used exclusively for the five schools designated in the MVC Record of Decision (Hunter High, Hunter Jr. High, West Valley Elementary, Whittier Elementary, Hillside Elementary). Are there other options?
 - Cameron presented the idea of making left-over funds available for other GSD schools (not necessarily in the MVC corridor) outside the five for AQ purposes.
 - Bo noted that "AQ purposes" (landscaping barriers, etc.) needs to be defined. What are the acceptable options and uses? He suggested that funds be used for post-construction evaluations (maybe over a 24-month period following implementation) of initial fixes prior to consideration for other purposes.
 - Linda noted parents may feel strongly that the programmed AWG funds be spent at the five schools noted in the ROD. Lee concurred that may be the best approach given the expectations that parents have. Kathy noted she is leaning towards using the funds for the five schools only. Reed favors keeping things as simple as possible, noting that the MVC is being implemented in phases and uncertainty surrounding future funding and transit sequencing.
 - Bo noted there is still no evidence air quality at the schools will worsen with construction of the MVC corridor.
 - Kathy anticipates the need for future monitoring activities. Should any extra funds be used for that or should unused funds go back to UDOT? Cameron suggested a pay-as-you-go plan. Reed noted that any funds given to GSD won't be returned as there is currently no UDOT mechanism for that and would incur administrative costs. Kathy and Cameron suggested that GSD be given the option to use its creativity to use extra funds at its own discretion for the five schools or other GSD schools within the MVC corridor. Cameron noted super-restrictive requirements may discourage GSD.
 - Bo proposed using excess funds for monitoring, education and awareness. The group reacted positively to this suggestion.
 - Linda, Cameron and Bo will collaborate to wordsmith specification #6 in the Agreement, detailing acceptable uses of AWG funds.
- Any other edits or comments should be sent ASAP to Reed, who will then do a math check and share the results with the Attorney General's (AG) office for feedback. He noted we are still about a month out from getting the AG's input.

- **Filling Open AWG Medical Position**
 - Cameron and Kathy are continuing the search for a candidate.
- **Schedule Next Meeting**
 - The next AWG meeting is tentatively scheduled for **Monday, June 22 @ 12:30 p.m. at Granite School District**. This meeting may be unnecessary if prior coordination regarding the DRAFT Agreement can be handled via email.

5/18 Action Items:

- Provide GSD portables asbestos data and documentation to Paul (Linda coordinated with Steve Hogan and Dan Dotson.)
- Follow up with GSD re: student growth projections and then let the AWG know their plans for future expansion and longevity for portables (Linda)
- Continue reviewing the DRAFT Cooperative Agreement and send Reed any further comments for incorporation; then Reed will forward a revised version to the AG for review. (AWG, Paul)
- Collaborate to wordsmith specification #6 in the Agreement, detailing acceptable uses of AWG funds (Linda, Cameron, Bo)
- Internally discuss the possibility of hiring a local, independent, third-party consulting firm to oversee and review filtration implementation (AWG)
- Continue collaboration to fill the open AWG medical role (Cameron, Kathy)
- Internally coordinate facilitation contract modification for Langdon Group (AWG to send comments to Reed.)